



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/710,322

07/01/2004

Radu Calinescu

SYCH 1110-1

4321

44654 7590 10/08/2008

SPRINKLE IP LAW GROUP  
1301 W. 25TH STREET  
SUITE 408  
AUSTIN, TX 78705

EXAMINER

KEEHN, RICHARD G

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2456

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/08/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/710,322	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CALINESCU ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Richard G. Keehn	<b>Art Unit</b> 2152	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Richard G. Keehn. (3) Kevin A. Gus (Agent)t.

(2) Dohm Chankong. (4) Ari G. Akmal (Attorney).

Date of Interview: 02 October 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,6,60 and 72.

Identification of prior art discussed: US 6,498,786 (Kirkby et al.), US 6,766,348 (Combs et al.), and US 2003/0069972 (Yoshimura et al.).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed 102 rejection of Claim 1, 103 rejection of Claim 60, 112 rejection of Claim 6 and 101 rejection of Claim 72. Applicant described inventive concept and differences to prior art. Examiner made suggestions on how to amend the independent claims to better reflect their invention and to possibly overcome the cited prior art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Dohm Chankong/ Examiner, Art Unit 2152	
--	--